

The two prime requisites for a coach are that he be a good judge of men and a good field-play director. He must make no mistakes in his choice of men for the different positions; he must not err in the system of training to which he subjects them. In the actual playing, he must be able to point out strength and weakness, to provide for the utilization of the former, and the repair of the latter. He must direct the general style of play, suggest improvements, and, above all, arouse hearty enthusiasm and co-operation. There are no other requisites beyond these; if the college can not supply him material for the team, it is no part of his province to search it out among outsiders.

The professional coach has usurped a place in college athletics that does not belong to him. He is well paid, generally over-paid; the athletic committee want the worth of their money in the team produced and games won. Their judgment soon comes to count for nothing against that of the hiring; if they do not yield to him, he "won't answer for the result." In all cases, the judgment and advice of the committee should be supreme over that of anyone else. The hiring of a professional coach is, in that case, unnecessary.

If we have at all correctly outlined the function of a coach, no one will deny that we at Queen's need a coach during the football season; not only did we sadly need one this fall, but we need one every fall. What we are protesting against is the hiring of a professional to act in that capacity. It is surely an anomaly for a university to have to import its football brains, for us to have to hire an outsider to do our thinking and planning

and judging for us. There are plenty of men around the college and in the city who are perfectly fitted, both by their experience and interest in Queen's and the game to fulfil the duties of a coach. There are enough graduates and former players in Kingston to do our coaching for us, in conjunction with the team captain and the athletic committee. It may be objected that these men will not devote their time and undertake the responsibility without being paid. We answer that they undertake no responsibility; the committee are the responsible parties. As to the other objection, we do not believe that a man should be asked to give his time without recompense, but the remuneration should be strictly limited to payment for actual service rendered. We want no paid interference in our athletic affairs by men who make a business of coaching, and who earn their living at it. We can learn from the actual operation of the system in the American colleges, that commercialism and professionalism militate against the true interests of sport; and they are abhorrent to the instincts of the true sportsman. In America the cry is, "The professional must go"; in Queen's we shall see to it that the professional does not come.

WHATSOEVER THINGS ARE PURE.

IT was in the winter of 1902 that we had our first and our last opportunity of hearing Principal Grant. The address he gave on that occasion made a deep impression upon us. Full of the fiery energy that had carried him through dark days and over stony paths, which was soon, alas, to be burnt out, enthusiastic and hopeful, his voice tender with his love for